

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-9, 15-21 and 28 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 10-11, 14, 22-23 and 26-27 have been amended. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment.

Claims 1, 14 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart in view of Kawabata et al. Claim 1 has been amended to include features of claim 10 and claims 14 and 26 have been amended to include features of claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1, 14 and 26 with respect to Cowart, Kawabata et al. and Jenson et al. in view of Borland, which were cited in the rejection of claims 10-13 and 22-25, because the cited references, even if combined, still would not disclose or suggest an application program which transmits and receives time of application in which the application corresponding to the application program is performed, to and from another application program.

As stated in the Office Action "Cowart and Kawabata et al. fail to teach a storage means for storing an application program that is capable of transmitting and receiving time information." The Office Action, however, states that Jenson et al. teaches these features.

The Jenson et al. reference relates to a method for controlling a scheduler on a computer display, and teaches displaying both the calendar and a schedule within a single window. When a desired date or dates on the calendar is selected by an operator, the date or dates are automatically displayed on the window (see Figs. 5a-5d). Displaying the schedule of a selected date or dates on the same window, however, is not the same, nor does it disclose or suggest transmitting and receiving time of application in which the application corresponding to the application program is performed, as in the present invention. Therefore, even if the Jenson et al. reference were combined with the Cowart and Kawabata et al. references, the resulting device still would not disclose or suggest the present features for transmitting and receiving time of application in which the application corresponding to an application program is performed.

The Borland reference discloses a method for setting task reminders on the calendar. This reference also does not disclose or suggest an application program for transmitting and receiving time of application in which the application corresponding to the application program is performed, as in the present invention. Rather, Borland teaches transmitting and receiving

mail data with a time stamp in the Outlook program. The applications in the Outlook program, however, do not themselves know when mail is actually received, aside from the corresponding time stamp, which is not the actual time of receipt. The user is able to search a particular mail because each mail data has its own time stamp, and not because the Outlook applications know the actual date and time each mail is received. Accordingly, even if the Borland reference were combined with any of the other cited references, the resulting device still would not disclose or suggest the present application program for transmitting and receiving time of application. For these reasons, claims 1, 14 and 26 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 10-13, 22-25 and 27-28 depend from claims 1, 14 or 26, and are allowable for the same reasons given with respect to claims 1, 14 and 26.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart and Kawabata et al. in view of Jenson et al. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 28 have been canceled. Applicant traverses with respect to claim 27 for the reasons given with respect to claim 26 from which claim 27 depends.

Claims 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart, Kawabata et al. and Jenson et al. in view of Heatherington et al. Claims 5 and 17 have been canceled.

Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart, Kawabata et al. and Jenson et al. in view of Borland. Claims 7 and 19 have been canceled.

Claims 10-13 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowart, Kawabata et al. and Jenson et al. in view of Borland. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claims 1 and 14, from which these claims depend, and because of the additional features described in claims 10-13 and 22-25.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

B. Joe Kim

Reg. No. 41,895

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4354

Dated: May 27, 2003